

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/690,113	GEVA ET AL.	
	Examiner Hoa C. Nguyen	Art Unit 2841	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hoa C. Nguyen. (3) Kammie Cuneo (SPE AU 2841).  
 (2) Ido Tuchman. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 20 April 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-18.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 6353189, US 4816616.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

**KAMMIE CUNEY**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2840**  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The interview is mainly about a disagreement over the interpretation of the prior arts. Applicant argued: (a) Reference art (US 6353189) does not have a trace cover formed on a circuit board but indeed formed in a circuit board. (b) Reference art (US 4816616) does not have a trace cover formed on a circuit board but instead a miniature assembly with integrated transmission line shielding. The examiner disagreed with both arguments because: (a) In case of the reference art US-6353189, the examiner considers the layers underneath references 2 and 1 as a circuit board; therefore, the shielding structure (reference 2/7a/4) is considered as formed on the circuit board. (b) In case of reference art US-4816616, the examiner considers the miniature electric assembly as a circuit board having conductive lines with shielding structure formed on top surface of the board. An agreement was not reached because each party has a different point of view on the preference arts. The examiner also suggested the applicant to review over the new dependent claims (claims 27-31) and look over a disclosed reference art (US-6608258) before amending the claims.